BEFORE THE
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD

In re: NAS JRB/ARS WILLOW GROVE

A meeting was held before Loretta B. Devery, Registered Professional Reporter and Notary Public, at Willow Grove Naval Air Station, Willow Grove, Pennsylvania, on Wednesday, January 14, 1998, commencing at 6:00 P.M.

PRESENT:

JIM EDMOND
CDR. TERRAY WOOD
LT. CDR. LE MASTER
COL. RICHARD MOSS
MAJ. MARGE McGLINN
RUSSELL TURNER
JAMES COLTER
DREW MARCOTTE
PAUL GRECO
DEBBIE FELTON
JULIE WIDMAN
KEN TYSON
MARY "LIZ" GEMMILL
ERIC LINDHULT
BARBARA CURTIS
RICHARD PEFFALL
TED ROTH
THOMAS HIBBS
JIM VETRINI
RAY LEOPOLD
JACK DUNLEAVY
PAM REIGH
CHRISTY HUGHES
TOM FRIEDMAN
DANIEL McCAFFREY
DARIUS OSTRAUSKAS
TIM SHEEHAN

ALL POINTS REPORTING
723 Erlen Road
Norristown, PA 19401
(610) 272-6731

MR. EDMOND: If we can bring the meeting to order. I'd like to welcome everyone to the first meeting of 1998 Naval Air Station Restoration Advisory Board, Willow Grove. For the first order of business, I'd like to introduce the new military co-chair, Commander Terray Fox. He's our new Executive Officer. He's also the new --

CDR. WOOD: Terray Wood.

MR. EDMOND: Terray Wood, I'm sorry. But Terray Wood. And he's the new Executive Officer and he'll be the new co-chairperson for the next two or three years.

Also, I'd like to ask the RAB members that are here, did everyone receive their Community Relation Plan?

RAB MEMBERS: Yes.

MR. EDMOND: Then we'll get right on to business. The Air Force will give the first presentation. It will be update on their remediation actions since the last RAB meeting in September.

MS. WIDMAN: And now that you've got that all set up, we need to do the overhead.

Basically, what I wanted to do tonight was just give a brief synopsis of where we are with the investigation of the washrack. Whoever packed my folder didn't pack the right overheads, so we'll just work with this one.

Just to refresh your memory as to why we're out at the washrack in the first place, someplace that's a little old. We had several objectives for the work we did out there. One, we wanted to find out if the washrack for the washrack area and the trickling filter were a source of the concentrations of VOCs we see in ground water in that area.

Another objective was to find out if the washrack area could be a source of the VOCs that are seen in the Privet Road monitoring wells and in the Navy supply wells.

And the third objective was to see if maybe there was another source in that area that could be contributing VOCs, you know, to the ground water beneath the washrack.

So in a nutshell, we're looking for the source of VOCs that are in the ground water beneath and downgradient of the washrack.

In order to do that, we performed a field investigation that started in November, and actually we just completed yesterday, and that investigation had two components. One was to investigate the soils themselves that remain in the area of the washrack where the former trickling filter and piping are; and the other component was to investigate ground water conditions.

What we did in terms of the soils, we did 10 soil borings. Those borings themselves were performed where the trickling filter was before, beneath the former piping, and in the area of the buildings. A sample was collected from each of those borings, submitted to the lab, and it's being analyzed for volatile organic compounds, semi-volatile organics and TPH. So those soil samples are all off at the lab seeing what's happening to them.

We did quite a bit more work involving the ground water in that area. We installed monitoring wells in three different locations. We put one well downgradient of the washrack, we paired it up with an existing well, and that was a deeper well. It's an intermediate depth well. We put a

well between the washrack and the Privet Road Landfill to see what concentrations were in that area. And we also put a well cluster, meaning an intermediate depth well and a water table well off to the west of the landfill to see if in fact there could be another source in that direction.

We did more or less a step-by-step approach to installing the wells to find out as much as we could from the bore holes before we actually put a well in them. And what we did was we did a bunch of down-hole goephysics. We ran several different tools to tell us different things. And we ran down-hole video, which if I can get the audio/visual equipment to work well, I'll try to show you some of them that? We also did vertical flow meter work to see how ground water was flowing within the bore holes, meaning up or down.

And then finally, we did packer testing. And what packer testing is is you take and seal off an interval in the bore hole. It has rubber packers that essentially isolate an interval in the bore hole. And then you can pump water from that and sample it. And what that can tell you is what the concentrations are in that fracture that

you've isolated. And you can see if the concentrations are different than fractures that are above that or below it. It's a good way to vertically profile what contaminant concentrations are as you move downward without having to put a whole bunch of wells to do it.

And after we did all those things, we went in and put the monitoring wells in. And then just last week and this week, we sampled them. And we sampled all the existing wells at the washrack, our new wells, and the existing wells at Privet Road Landfill. So those samples just went in. They're being analyzed for volatiles and semi-volatiles similar to the soil and also for dissolved metals.

I can't tell you anything exciting about what all of this means, because if you haven't gotten the idea, you'll get it soon, it's all just a pile of data at this point. And we're also waiting for a bunch of laboratory results. So essentially, where we are is at the completion of the field investigation stage and now we'll get into the data analysis and the report writing and figure out if we can, you know, satisfy our objective of figuring out what the source of the contaminants in the

area of the washrack is.

Now I want to switch over to the VCR. See if we can do this. This may be a little bit jerky once I get it started. Actually this is probably better than my video, but I haven't turned it on yet. I wanted to explain for a minute what you're going to be seeing.

When we do down-hole TV, we essentially lower a television or video camera into the bore hole on a cable and just lower it progressively down through the hole and it takes a picture of what it sees. It sees it really from two angles when you use the kind of camera that we had. You see actually straight down and around the sides or it flips to the side view. By doing this, I think we get probably what is the best visual representation of what the rocks look like down there that you possibly can get.

If you're familiar with conventional coring where we pull rock out of the hole and look at it, that's good, but you're left to reconstruct it once it's on the ground. With the down-hole video, we actually can see what it looks like in place.

And the bore hole I've chosen is a real good one for this because we can actually see the fractures in the rock where the ground water is moving through them. So if you've ever really wondered what water flow looks like at depth under the ground, this is what it's going to look like.

Now, I'm not sure how clear this is going to be, but we'll give it a shot and see if it works. This is Building 320. I'm hesitant to fast forward this because we'll be in the bore hole in a second. Right now you're inside a surface casing moving downward. Okay, this is -- and then you hit the water right there. The numbers in the middle are the depth below the ground surface. And at this point you're not seeing rock, you're seeing casing.

MR. EDMOND: Feet or meters on that?

MS. WIDMAN: That's feet, I'm sorry. We just went into the rock. And you can see some vertical fractures there on the lower left. Now, it flipped to side view so we can get a better look at what those fractures appear to be. The black thing that is strategically in the wrong place is the strut on the camera. But what you're looking at there is a side view of the vertical fracture we

just before that saw in plan view. And what he's doing is moving down that fracture, meaning the camera operator, looking at it. That's a pretty nice hole right there. The white cement you -- the white stuff you see there is actually cement infilling some of the fractures.

Now, at this point the bore hole has gotten much smoother. So you're out of one of the fracture zones. And this is what the bulk of the rock looks like down there. The common understanding of the Stockton formation, which is the bedrock underlying the Naval Air Station and the Air Reserve Station, is that most of the water flows through fractures. And when you see how smooth that bore wall hole is and then when you see where the holes are, it makes sense that, yes, that probably only water does move through the fractures, it doesn't move between the individual grains in the rock.

MR. ROTH: Any information on who or when that cementing was performed?

MS. WIDMAN: It's just natural precipitation of silica from the ground water moving through the fractures at one time.

I'm to go ahead and fast forward this down to some interesting intervals. I guess anybody who wants to hang around afterwards, we can look at this in more detail, but I realize most of you aren't geologists, so you don't probably get as excited by this as some of us do.

Once we get down around 50 feet, you'll start seeing some of the more fractured intervals we have here. What you're seeing in this view is just one of those sealed or at least partially sealed fractures. And there were a lot of them in there. For the geologists, there's some nice structures in here, sedimentary structures. You know, it's just as valuable as looking at core, you can really see a lot.

You see there are particles that you can see sometimes, that stuff floating in the water, sediment. On the sides of the bore hole, you can see those narrow fractures that are really sealed, you know, by that natural cement. Water's not moving through those probably. Some nice cross-bedding, which is original structure on the sandstone, for the geologists in the crowd, and some slum features.

The side view camera actually is about a foot -- the number there is about a foot too deep. So when you're 48 down, it's saying 49. It's just the difference in positioning of the lens on the camera as it moves down.

We're going to start moving into some of the areas that were very heavily fractured. And I believe it's real close here where we start traveling down one single vertical fracture.

MR. TURNER: You leave the bore hole?

MS. WIDMAN: No. The thing is just running. He's just lowering a cable down the hole. More silica cement. And the beginnings of the fractured areas should be coming right up.

There on the left-hand side, you can't really see it that well in this picture, there's a vertical fracture opening up and we should shoot right into it about now.

It's a nice hole where you can actually see water flowing into the bore hole out of that actual horizontal fracture. It's one of the best views of flowing ground water I've ever seen. We're very prominent in the fractures here. Some of them have cement in them, some of them don't. By cement,

I mean the white you see.

Another opening where water is coming in. The black holes are essentially pretty big fractures, relatively speaking. I couldn't tell you exactly how big, you know, they are except I can tell you that camera strut you see to the left is a couple inches wide. So this is one of the intervals we packer tested. You know, we sealed packers above and below these fractures and took water samples to see what kinds of concentrations were in that water.

And this whole zone from around 50 to I think it was about 66 feet had a lot of fractures in it and you're seeing some of the best of them here.

MS. CURTIS: How wide is the bore hole?

MS. WIDMAN: The bore hole is eight inches in diameter. And this has really been almost one continuous vertical fracture. I mean if you spun around the camera so you can see the horizontal ones that intersect it, but that's been pretty much continuous vertically for since up around 40 some feet. You can continue to see the vertical fracturing to the lower right. If you see particles moving upward in the bore hole, I don't know how far away that can be seen, that's because there are

upward gradients in this bore hole and their water is flowing up, even though the heavier particles are sinking down.

Another nice vertical fracture, horizontal fracture.

MR. ROTH: Have these particles been dislodged by the camera?

MS. WIDMAN: Possibly. The hole has -- the bore hole has silt in it because of the drilling process and because it was disturbed. Before we ran the camera, we did let the bore hole sit at least overnight to let, you know, the finer grains settle out. But, you know, there's still some silt in there.

I think that's actually the end of the exciting stuff. I just wanted to give you a chance to see what it really looks like down there.

MR. EDMOND: Okay, Julie, thank you very much. That was really interesting. That was great.

MS. WIDMAN: If anybody wants to see it afterwards, I'll play it again.

MR. EDMOND: We're going to move on to the Navy Phase II.

MR. TYSON: We just have one more for the Air Force.

MR. EDMOND: Okay. I'm sorry.

MR. TYSON: Well, I don't have any down-hole camera video to show you, but I am going to bring you up to date on the activities that have been taking place out at the POL area. Since the last RAB meeting, just to refresh your memory, we are in the process of moving forward with a pilot study at this time to address residual jet fuel product, which is believed to be the source of hydrocarbons in ground water in that area of the site.

Prior to the last RAB meeting, we had completed a number of activities. The pilot study work plan was finalized in August of 1997. The pilot study work plan for a combination soil vapor extraction/ground water extraction pilot study to be conducted out at the site.

On August 25th, 1997, we completed 24-hour ground water extraction/soil vapor extraction performance tests, and that was recorded in the following month of September. The results of that test indicated the need for somewhat more

extensive six-day soil vapor extraction/ground water extraction performance test, which we recently completed.

We went into October doing the contractual modifications to implement the test. A no-cost contract modification for the six-day performance test was completed in October. We completed the work plan for the six-day performance test in November of 1997. And then in December of 1997, just before Christmas, we implemented the performance test.

And I can tell you from personal experience that this is a continuous test, run 24 hours a day, and I can tell you from personal experience that Willow Grove Air Reserve Station is a mighty lonely place about 3:00 in the morning when you're doing a test like this.

We have just completed the draft report on the test, it was submitted last week, and it is undergoing review at this time. We expect about a three-week review period for that report. And then once that report is reviewed and complete, it is anticipated at this time that we will move forward with the pilot study per se, which will include the

installation of -- well, a total installation of five recovery wells, three of which will be -- I'm sorry, two of which will be retrofits of existing wells and three will be new recovery wells. And we anticipate that activity to be in mid February or so.

The actual pilot system construction will commence in late February or early March. And we expect to have the system up and running by sometime mid March to late March. So that's the time frame, that's what we've completed thus far, and we expect to be moving forward from this point. Okay.

MR. EDMOND: As I was saying, we'll move on to the Navy's Phase II RI. I know at the last RAB meeting we stated we were going to give you the Phase II RI for review by this time, but because of the depth -- this is the Phase II RI right here, these two volumes, and we're just reviewing it now ourselves. So what we've come up with a solution, we were afraid that if we gave you those two volumes to review, we would not have a Restoration Advisory Board any longer. So we're going to give the RAB members an option. You have a choice of these two

volumes here to review or an executive summary to review. I know the Erics and the Jacks will take the two volumes, but I'm not sure who else wants to go through this, or they can review this. So at the end, let me know who wants what and we'll get you a copy in the next few weeks. I think, Jim, how long before we give a copy to the RAB members?

MR. COLTER: We're shooting for mid March.

MR. EDMOND: Mid March. Mid March we'll get you a copy for your review. But like I said, I was scared we were going to not have a RAB board if I sent everyone those binders.

Without any ado, Jim Colter, as you all know, is our Restoration Program Manager, and he'll give us the brief on the Phase II RI.

MR. COLTER: That was it. As Jim said, since the last RAB meeting, Brown and Root has been putting together, and this is a rough draft for mainly internal review, and myself and Debbie Felton and Barbara Douglas and Jim and his group have been reviewing this and providing comments. And before we send it out draft with our recommendations, there's certain things, we want to make sure, our

recommendations are accurate, and we probably will have some type of technical subcommittee meeting prior or during the review process to make sure that the regulators are on board with our conclusions.

The only other thing of interest before I get into the site, I'd just like to make a couple announcements. Mr. Darius Ostrauskas is now our new EPA Region 3 representative, replacing Steve Hirsh. And for those of you who probably don't know, Mr. Dave Kennedy, who was our Pennsylvania DEP rep, passed away last week. So I guess he had an extensive illness. So we'll be having another Pennsylvania DEP rep probably at the next meeting.

So other than that, and Jack Dunleavy is the newest RAB member, you'll remember him from being my side kick for a number of years, so looking forward to his expertise.

MR. DUNLEAVY: Thanks, Jim.

MR. COLTER: The other thing that we're doing concurrently is the Site 10 installation of the free product recovery system. You'll recall we did a two-year pilot study on several methods of product recovery and sent out a document basically to state to the RAB documenting what we'd like to

do. That system is installed. We had hoped to have it up and running during October through December time frame, but contractors have some problems with the computer system.

MR. EDMOND: Two of the three are running now.

MR. COLTER: It is running now?

MR. EDMOND: Yes.

MR. COLTER: Okay. They put what's called an auto dialer on. And basically it's a simple system just to tell the contractor from a remote location if the system is working or not. They had hoped to have installed a more integral system where you can actually turn pumps on and off, shut valves on and off, but they had some trouble getting that up and going. So we just had them turn on, it's a simple system to get product recovery underway.

Concurrently with that effort, the State EPA requested that we do one last round of soil and ground water samples to determine if there's any non-petroleum products at the fuel farm. EA Engineering has given us a rough draft of this report, which we're in the midst also of commenting

on. And once we get our comments resolved in this, we'll be sending this out as well for your review. You'll probably be getting this report prior to Phase II. As Jim said earlier, we're shooting for mid March to get that document out. That's about it as far as RI activities.

MR. EDMOND: Russ Turner, our contractor from Brown and Root, is going to give us a demonstration on the GIS. It's a computer generated mapping system that puts together maps and photos together so we can better understand, from a remedial point of view, and even for the regulators, to show where our sites are on the base, where the wells are, where the soil samples are taken. And it will all be one format. Instead of having a bunch of reports this size, and we have plenty of those, we'll have one computer disk with all the information on it. Russ and Brown and Root started the operation, and he'll give us a short demonstration on what they've got done so far.

MR. DUNLEAVY: Jim, I just have a quick question on the RI. How long will the RAB members have to review the report?

MR. COLTER: About a week.

MR. DUNLEAVY: A week? Just like old times.

MR. COLTER: Probably more along the lines of maybe two months.

MR. DUNLEAVY: Two months, okay. And will it be concurrent with the review that the regulators are doing too or have they already been through that?

MR. COLTER: It will be concurrent.

MR. EDMOND: There's a hand-out here, Russ gave everyone a hand-out. It will give you an idea of what the GIS system does.

MR. TURNER: There will be two phases. There's going to be a little talk to see what the film is going to be, then we're going to run a film with the computer. It's pretty high tech, so we'll have some fun with it.

I'm hoping that, you know, by the end of this, you'll see what the capability of the system, you'll see why the Navy asked us to put this together. But a couple years ago, when we were working on Phase II RI work plan, etc., the Navy requested that we look at doing some better mapping. And if you turn to page 2, in terms of an

overview -- so we looked around and we said what resources were available. And we said, well, there were computer aided design drawings available, there was commercial mapping sources like USGS, U.S. Geologic Service maps, quadrangle maps. There are aerial photographs out there which can be purchased generally commercially, they're available different ways, sometimes on the internet for free. And then what we've been doing over the years, I don't know how many years here, 15 years?

MR. EDMOND: Close to it.

MR. TURNER: In our RI investigations, we've collected data. And it's put in a database. So after seeing what was available, we proposed we could use maybe some of the latest PC software and prepare a thing called a Geographic Information System. What a GIS is is basically the computer hardware and software that's used to create and combine Information Management System, IMS, in this case, it's an environmental information management system, a geoenvironmental information management system, a lot of words. What it's good for is it's a tool.

If we turn to the page with the bullets

on it, it provides the Navy with a tool, a way to make sense of the data. It can answer direct questions. You can ask the GIS in soil boring number 1 at Site 1, what's the concentration at what depth. We can ask it general questions like where do concentrations exceed a certain limit, a regulatory limit or something like that. And then the other thing it helps you do is, since our maps are in the same system as our data and our data is three-dimensional because it has depth, we can visualize 3D relationships.

For instance, a soil boring sample at certain depth has a concentration. You might want to know what's its proximity to ground water. You can find it by clicking on the soil boring, find the sample you're looking for, and associated with that, it will pop up a menu and pop up a spreadsheet, it will have information about that soil boring and the sample location, like the X and Y coordinates.

So my purpose here was to let you know what's coming up here. The film that's coming up is a movie, it's not an online demonstration. It's a demonstration of the GIS. I'm not going to be online querying the database itself because the

queries take a long time. So it's a canned demonstration.

The advantage, a couple of the good things about the film itself, we can stop it at any time to answer questions. We can go backwards, if we want to, to the beginning. And we can actually skip through different slides at different topics. So just let me know and we can do any of those things.

MR. EDMOND: We're also putting our sewer lines on it, our electrical lines. We're going to have a database with not only the IR information, but for the Navy's point of view, we're going to put all our public works information on this same type of database. And everything can be overlaid and used in conjunction with one another. So it has a lot of different uses, not just for the IR program.

Tell me when you're ready, Russ.

MR. TURNER: I am happy to announce that I'm taking a course in remedial computer operations and I'm going to be employable one of these days once I get my certificate.

Okay, we want to find D drive. That's

our logo here. Okay, these first series of slides are going to show us how we access information in GIS. The overall, our company in general has been working at numerous locations. What you're looking at is a representation of obviously where the sites in the United States we can work at.

Generally on the left are things called themes that can be turned on and off. You can see the United States is turned on now. We're going to try to get the information, we're looking at -- this happens to be Pennsylvania. We're going to zoom in on Pennsylvania. We know it's in Southeast Pennsylvania. We've already asked it to highlight NAS JRB. So now we are looking basically at the USGS map which is imbedded in the GIS system. It's one of, essentially, the layers.

If you look at what we call the themes on the left there in the gray, we have turned on CAD drawings, we have turned on buildings, you can see the buildings. And we just now are giving a demonstration of how we can identify features and put tags on them.

Within the GIS system, we put in seven aerial photographs. This is the 1995, you can see

in the lower left-hand corner. The operator clicked to activate that theme, so that's what you see now. We'll go through here. I'll probably speed this part up because we go through the aerial photographs and sort of show a history. You might notice, because it actually works, as we proceed to the past, you'll actually be able to see how the development, there will be more farms, look like farms around the facility. And then the final aerial photograph in 1948, you'll see the runway doesn't even look like it does right now. It was much shorter, it was basically only the lower end.

This is Building 1 I think right there. Is that about right? We just turned on the aerial photograph for 1962. You can see some people were here when we had a discussion about the little investigation of Tinius Olson, that's this facility right here, sort of built into the air station.

You'll notice -- I think the important thing to notice here, there's significant aircraft parking facility here in the Air Force end. I think this is also hard concrete parking here for the Navy. All that disappears in later photographs of course.

One of the things this demonstrates is the layered nature of the GIS system. One of the things we might use this layered nature for later, we're going to demonstrate it actually, is we can find out where our sites are first of all in an actual photograph, and we can look at where the samples were taken on the aerial photographs. And then the next thing we'll end up doing, we'll end up querying the system to find out concentration of the compound above some sort of a limit which will be actually be for PCBs at Site 1, Privet Road compound.

MR. EDMOND: You can see where the new runway is being extended to the old runway, the black compared to the white.

MR. TURNER: What year is this? 1956, yeah. So this is -- and you also notice, you know, look at the farms, you know, I think this is all houses in the later ones. Over here, I think we have some industrial parks in 1995, this is 1956.

MR. EDMOND: That's where the country club is too.

MR. TURNER: Here's the last aerial photograph, you can just see that essentially most

of the Air Force -- oh, by the way, these buildings are still turned on because we never clicked them off over here in the themes. However, the buildings didn't exist in 1946. It's a different layer that's showing through. I can't control that. That's, like I said, this is a film clip or a movie more than an online demonstration. I would go over and click those off to see which buildings existed. But here you can see the rural nature around and how short the runway was in 1946.

The next series of slides we're going to show some of the capabilities, we're going to turn on some of the other themes like soil borings, I think we're going to start with maybe surface water samples and sediment samples and walk through that and show how it's a type of query, it's a simple query, but it's very visual. So we'll go over to the theme area and we'll turn off, on and off themes that we want to look at.

Now, we've clicked on soil sample locations and they showed. We click them off and we click on surface water sample locations, then it rebuilds a map, it actually builds a new map for each new theme that you're looking for, each new

theme demonstration that you're looking for.

Ground water, then water levels, and when we get into the water level location, we're going to demonstrate the other thing I mentioned before, that behind, sort of behind, in a different layer, associated, related to that water level or that ground water sample location and associated water level at that, there's basically wells there in each of those locations. There's a water level associated with it as well as other information like the XY coordinates, you know, from the survey, the vertical elevation based on the latest vertical data. And not only that, within the database, we talk about the quality of the data as well.

At the base, we had two survey coordinate systems that we had to combine into the GIS. So we used the NAPD, which is the latest, mid '80s basically, version of the survey coordinates. However, we still mentioned in the database where the data originally came from so people can tell if it's a derived number. We like to maintain that history. So we were on to monitoring well, we show its surface elevation at the ground at the well, its X and Y coordinates, etc.

Another thing you might be interested in, I mention you see we had clicked on the buildings, we can use the GIS system to identify features that we see on the maps. We clicked on the tool in the upper -- in the tool bar, and then we go and find -- click on a building or a soil sample or whatever, and we can identify what the thing is. There's all the soil sample locations back again.

Now we want to build a query. We're going to ask the database where soil borings at Site 1 are located. We happen to know that Site 1 is 01. So it's going to -- now it's just looking through the database, I think there are 33,000 files it has to look at, so it takes a little time to do this job.

MR. ROTH: Files or records?

MR. TURNER: Records. Well, let's see within the relational database, it would be cells, so they would be records.

There's Site 1 soil borings. Now this is a feature on the tool bar, we change our pointer to a tool that we can use to zoom in. Now what also happens here is the preference from the USGS map goes to the CAD drawings. They're still both turned

on over there, but the scale now is closer, smaller. And now we're using the CAD drawings that were generated by the NAS JRB, by a contractor in the early '90s, I believe, which we've imported all those electronically into the GIS.

Now there are a lot of lines here. It takes a few minutes, it's going to show us where the soil borings are at Site 1 Privet Road. This is useful in helping a person online visualize, well, where are they and what are the buildings. We know that one of the buildings we always talk about is the bowling alley. So here's a demonstration, we're going to find out which one is the bowling alley. A lot of us know which one is the bowling alley. But if you didn't know, you could just go clicking around until you find it. There it is. And it's not a big surprise, there's a whole cluster of soil samples taken around that.

Now each of those soil samples, like I mentioned before, not each one, but they're taken at various depth intervals. So we could click on any of those soil samples, find the concentrations by different depth intervals. But what we want to do I think will be to continue a query. This is where we

want to find out, ask the system. We know Privet Road, one of the concerns at Privet Road has been a PCB spill in the past. There was a situation where PCB transformers were stored near the Privet Road compound, and there was a spill. So let's ask -- we're going to ask the system where PCB concentrations in soil samples at Privet Road exceed 10,000 ppb or 10 ppm.

So what we did was we opened the window into the database, which was always right behind the map. We just opened the window and we do the -- we build the query. And now it takes a little longer for this. One up in the upper left, you can see the number of records that have to be searched. I think there were 8,400 samples -- hang on a second -- at Site 1. That's the previous number that was used. There are going to end up being fewer. I think 21 PCB samples above 10,000 ppb, 10 ppm.

You note too, to build the database, it literally took all those years that Jim had mentioned, 15, whatever it is, to collect the data. We, as much as possible, incorporated it electronically. There are 21 samples of the 33,000 with PCB above 10 ppm, parts per million.

What can we do with this? We can search each sample to see what the depth is and we can plot it, because it's a GIS system. So we plotted it different colors. So the yellow samples are those which are above 10,000 ppb for PCBs, polychlorinated biphenyls, easy for me to say. And then we can zoom in on it by using the CAD drawings, or we could show it on an aerial photograph to get a feel for where those samples were taken in relation to the parking lot and the bowling alley. And those are the last two things we want to do.

I have a feeling even though I didn't fast forward much through this, we went pretty fast. So if anybody has a particular question, we could go back to any of the slides, it's not difficult. I can use this control panel in the lower right-hand corner. It gives me a pop-up menu to go back to different slides if we have to do that.

But in a minute or two, it's going to show us the soil samples at Site 1 on the aerial photograph of 1995, because that's the one it uses.

The real power of this is now Jim Colter, Jim Edmond, and I have a copy of it, we have the GIS on our desks, in our desktops. We have the

ARC View software to read it. So we can do any of the queries that you saw demonstrated here. We can build any of the maps that you saw here. And we can print them out in color if we have a color printer.

MR. EDMOND: Thanks, Russ. Any questions for Russ on the GIS?

MR. COLTER: Just one thing I'd like to mention is one of the reasons that the report didn't get out as quickly as we had thought is that at the same time that they were interpreting the data, we had Russ and his group work on this GIS. And you can see how much data input there had to be, and it's a quite lengthy process.

The reason we gave you a little show about this now of its capabilities is, not at the next RAB meeting, but the one after, which will be right in the middle of the review process, you know, we'll be using the online, hopefully GIS system up here, to be shown you what some of the questions we asked, what some of the concerns we were -- wanted to get an answer to, and how we used the GIS and will hopefully graphically show you some of the thought process we went through in coming up with our recommendations.

So we wanted to give you a little flavor as to what you can expect and how we plan on using it to interpret that report.

MR. LINDHULT: Jim, is the intent to utilize the GIS to select sampling points for data optimization, in other words, where you have data gaps and select the best points?

MR. COLTER: Yeah, that will be one of the uses, you know, we'll take a look graphically and in 3D at certain things and see if we have holes. Right off the bat, I can't imagine how many holes we could possibly have with that. But once you see it graphically in 3D, you can pick them out right away, if there's an item that you need to maybe get a better handle on. That's one of the uses we're going to hopefully query.

MR. DUNLEAVY: We used to characterize how much soil you take out, you can seeing it in 3D.

MR. ROTH: Question, a couple of them. One, the aerials and the charts are only going to be in looks like four reams of paper there?

MR. COLTER: I don't think we have any aerials in there, it's just mostly the CAD drawings in the report there. One of our hopes is, you know,

the CAD drawings that were inserted into that report came from the GIS.

MR. TURNER: The map in front of you was --

MR. ROTH: Have you given any thought to distributing that on a CD? It would be a lot less expensive and gives all the information available to everybody.

MR. COLTER: Oh, definitely. Unfortunately, I'm not sure the capabilities of say our regulatory agencies, what their PC capabilities are. The Navy, we tend to be getting some pretty good and expensive equipment. Pennsylvania State may not be in the same position. Certainly community members probably don't have anything at home that has enough memory to run a disk that you would need to run that type of program.

If somebody -- I believe if somebody does have the capabilities and is interested in getting the disk, I don't see why we couldn't get one out. But I'd have to check on that because there is some proprietary information issues associated with this.

MR. TURNER: To run the GIS, you would

need the ARC View software.

MR. ROTH: There's not a run time?

MR. TURNER: Pardon me?

MR. ROTH: There's not a run time period?

MR. EDMOND: A loop version, like we just had.

MR. TURNER: Oh, you could run that, what we just had you could run on a CD.

MR. DUNLEAVY: What does run time mean? What do you mean by the term "run time," a one time use software, shared --

MR. ROTH: Allow you to view it and see it, but not modify it.

MR. DUNLEAVY: What Russ is referring to is like you need Auto CAD, you need Word Perfect, you need a specific type of software to be able to call up and use in real time. It would probably cost about a thousand dollars at least.

MS. FELTON: It's 750 to purchase it.

MR. TURNER: It's a product that's commercially available by the company ESRI, ESRI. The other GIS firm is called Bentley, Bentley Intergraph. Those are the two.

MR. LEOPOLD: Can we download some of these off the internet through you folks?

MR. COLTER: Not at this time.

MR. TURNER: However, the data is the same. You see the two volumes there, the data is also included in the second volume. The people don't like to, you know, do that many pages of data, but it's all in there.

MR. EDMOND: Plus it also doubles as a good doorstop.

MR. DUNLEAVY: I can take it on the train with me.

MR. EDMOND: Do some light reading. Any other questions for Russ or Jim?

MS. CURTIS: Yes. Will there be a lot of these GIS maps in the report?

MR. TURNER: Yeah, there are a fair number of them. We're doing more color, it's easier to read, it's more understandable. It helps visualize things.

MR. COLTER: That was one of our goals, again putting a lot of workload on Russ and his company, for the rough draft for our internal review, we really didn't need all the color

and the easy-to-read maps, but when it came out to you, we wanted to be in a better position to have some color maps in there and maybe graphically show what we wanted to present, maybe a little easier to see like that.

MR. TURNER: Even this rough draft of the RI summary documents, I think there are half a dozen color photographs from the GIS system in here. Things up and running, you know, we're pulling out of the background samples that were taken, that same map there is one of the maps. There are a half a dozen or more. Now of course, this is probably far from complete in terms of getting some comments back.

MR. COLTER: I guess what we need to do is at some point pass a sheet of paper around, and if the RAB members could put their name on it and which presentation they prefer to review, either the full volume or the executive summary, we'll make sure we get it out to you as soon as it's ready.

MR. EDMOND: There's a sign-in sheet in the back, and there's also the RAB mailing list that I had you all look over and make sure the information and your phone numbers and addresses

were correct. What you could do on that one is just put down executive summary or full copy and I'll make sure you get what you choose. And for the RAB members who are not here, I think we'll send them out the executive summary with a letter stating if they want the full blown Phase II RI, we'll get them for them, but I'll warn them how thick and how heavy it is and they could have medical problems getting from the door to the desk.

MR. ROTH: The executive summary is included in the large one, in front of it?

MR. EDMOND: It's like a Readers' Digest of those two right there, that's what it's going to be. When I say the executive summary, it is the small one sitting there.

MR. ROTH: Usually it's included in the report.

MR. TURNER: Actually we named that report Phase II Remedial Investigation Summary Report so we wouldn't have that confusion.

MR. EDMOND: That's just my nomenclature, executive summary. We'll call it the Readers' Digest version.

MS. CURTIS: How much of that

two-volume report is lab data?

MR. EDMOND: The bottom one is lab data and the top one is text.

MR. COLTER: It's not all lab data, it's soil borings --

MR. TURNER: All the appendices in general.

MR. DUNLEAVY: The forms from the labs are not included in either one of those, right? That's another stack about a foot high, Barbara.

MR. TURNER: The summary lab data is probably an inch and a half thick on two sides.

MR. COLTER: But the top one has the background information, some overall base information, and then all the information on the four sites we did. That's why it's quite voluminous. It's almost four reports wrapped into one.

MR. EDMOND: Each section of each site is summarized also. There's an executive summary -- I'll call it an executive summary -- of each section on each site, whether it's environmental assessment, the health risk assessment, whatever, you can just read that if you wish. So it's your choosing.

MR. HIBBS: This information will be available online?

MR. EDMOND: No.

MR. HIBBS: This is just the software package that you're using to compile the data?

MR. EDMOND: Exactly.

MR. HIBBS: Do you plan on having some kind of information available online at some point based on the ability of the GIS?

MR. COLTER: That's something, I don't think any of our sites are online as far as the internet goes, and I don't know what the Navy's intention is as far as the IR program. That would have to be an initiative from our headquarters. And right now, there hasn't been any talk about getting any type of website going or anything like that.

MS. FELTON: Part of the problem, if I could add something, Jim, putting GIS online would be incredibly voluminous in terms of data, but also you need the software to run it. And as Russ was with pointing out, the ARC software that is required for this package costs about $750.00. And I think putting it on the internet would probably violate some kind of license agreement or something. So

that would prohibit that kind of distribution.

It may be possible to have the CD available, and if somebody had ARC Info available to them, they could view it, and we could make the CD available to you. But we could not put it online.

MR. McCAFFREY: How about the direct dialing modem to the database?

MR. DUNLEAVY: You'd be on the phone line. You saw how slow it was going here with a Pentium with a direct connection.

MR. LEOPOLD: Excuse me, there is a program out AAAs have, it's a toy, but it does handle the GIS. It's the AAA's mapinco by Delorum.

MS. FELTON: Right, I'm aware of that.

MR. LEOPOLD: And you can run that through, stick it in your car with a --

MS. FELTON: That's correct, but that is almost exclusively a mapping program, where the power of the GIS that we've got here that maybe -- which we didn't demonstrate entirely, is that it is backed up by mountains of data and things that you can question and query on. It's not just a mapping tool, it's mapping with data behind it. And so I think that program that you're speaking about would

fall considerably sort of what we'd need for something like that.

MR. ROTH: Let me just clarify, I think what they're talking about putting up is not the running things in the programs, but the output. If the output is put up, then perhaps in, you know, somebody using Acrobat or something like that could -- whatever format you put it up in --

MS. FELTON: Well, I'm not a computer wizard, I'll make that clear right up front. I'm not saying that's not possible, I'm not aware of that having been done yet.

MR. ROTH: This is output.

MS. FELTON: That's correct.

MR. ROTH: That's what would go on the website is output, not the running program.

MR. EDMOND: It wouldn't be interactive, it would be view only.

MR. ROTH: Yeah.

MR. TURNER: The database that we have in the GIS is Foxpro, and that's not particularly unusual, but you would be able to access the data through Foxpro, at least that part of the GIS.

MR. ROTH: If the data is in ASCII

form, you can download it in whatever you want to crunch it in.

MR. TURNER: You know, with the --

MR. COLTER: Right now, there's no initiative right now to get our data out to the public like that.

MR. ROTH: But either the CD Rom or the internet, we're dealing with output either way.

MR. COLTER: Right.

MR. EDMOND: The CD Rom end of it, like Jim and Debbie were saying, we could get you the CD Rom to use if you had the program to run it, but an internet site, that would be a DoD initiative, or at least a Department of the Navy initiative, and it would have to come from them before we could even go in that direction.

MR. ROTH: The CD Rom only has to be the output, it doesn't have to be the running program. So that could be viewable in Word Perfect or Word or several other programs.

MR. EDMOND: But it would have to fit into our budget to be able to produce something like that too.

MR. COLTER: Just to give you a CD --

MR. ROTH: It would cost you a lot less than this.

MR. COLTER: We can get you a CD, if you want a CD.

MR. ROTH: It would cost a great deal less to distribute.

MR. COLTER: Not everyone has that capability so we still have to give our hard bound copies and use the CD.

MR. EDMOND: It's got to go in the information repository in Horsham. We're mandated doing certain things. We can't give them a disk, we have to give them a hard copy.

MR. TURNER: A lot of those appendices especially are handwritten from the geogologists in the field. The text in the report is Microsoft Word. A lot of figures in there come from the GIS. So, you know, it would take more than one software to be able to view that if we did provide it electronically, and lot of it's not available electronically.

MS. FELTON: Russ, I think I'm understanding what the gentleman is looking for now is that the report could be put in a format just

with like an Adobe, Acrobat type of program that's readily available it could be read, the report itself, not the GIS.

MR. TURNER: Even if you don't have Microsoft Word. That's a good point.

MR. DUNLEAVY: I still find that it's easier to go to the information repository.

MR. EDMOND: Well, if there's no more questions on the GIS, I'd like to have a break, give everybody a chance to relax a minute, and we'll finish up the meeting on a TAG presentation by Bill Hudson. We've done this twice, but we're going to do it again because Jim is going to give us a full blown presentation on TAPP funding and, you know, give you, the RAB members, a chance to see the -- compare the two, the apples and the oranges, the TAG, which is an EPA grant, and the TAPP, which is a DoD grant.

But we'll take a 10-minute break.

(Recess.)

MR. EDMOND: If we're ready, we will get started. Mr. Bill Hudson will start. Bill is going to give a sort presentation on the TAG grants, Technical Assistance Grants, that the EPA has for

the Restoration Advisory Board. And Mr. Colter will give on the TAPP, which is a Technical Assistance Public Participation Grant, and basically the same thing, but the rules are different on how you get the money, the amount you can have, etc. And you can compare the two and see if they fit into the RAB's agenda.

So without any further ado, Mr. Hudson.

MR. HUDSON: Well, actually I was hoping that Jim was going to do the TAPP first, because the TAPP program is the DoD program for providing technical assistance. It's a new program, and to the best of my knowledge, there haven't been any TAPP grants actually issued yet; am I correct?

MR. COLTER: There was one pilot grant out in California, for a base out there. They ran through what they thought was the rules and tried to see the pitfalls and how it worked. And now there's actually legislation. If you want, Bill, I could do mine, if that's -- it doesn't matter.

MR. HUDSON: But I just want to basically point out the differences, and you can do that. The TAG program has been around for about five or six years now. And primarily, I mean, you

know, specifically what it's for is to provide technical assistance grants, that is to say to allow residents, actually potential stakeholders or those who are RAB members or residents who live near to a site that has a restoration program to get themselves a technical advisor to help them interpret materials that they may have some difficulty interpreting, such as the couple of volumes that you see on the table there.

We have, I think, in Region 3, I think we have at Federal installations about five or six TAG grants. There may be a couple more than that. So approximately maybe 35 percent of the installations have actual TAG grants going at this point and have a technical advisor working for them.

The TAG grants generally run in the amount of about $50,000.00, and the money and so forth is administered by the TAG grant group or the TAG committee. This group can be RAB members, it can be members exclusive of the RAB, or can be a combination. It's an organization you have to form, you have to incorporate this group, which is a relatively simple legal process, and you also have to get tax exempt status in order to become

nonprofit, which again is a relatively simple legal process.

You have to apply for this grant. We have a full time person located at Region 3, Amelia Levertz, who is very, very helpful in making the application process I would say totally painless. Now we have gotten it down to where it's a relatively simple process, but you do have to follow the rules.

And I would go back and try to point out again that in the beginning, unfortunately, I think a lot of times, the people who are thinking about a TAG grant or thinking about this money, they're thinking about using funds to get their point across or to second guess what EPA is doing or the installation is doing, to look into new matters that haven't been looked into. All of these things are not what the TAG grant is for.

The TAG grant is to help you interpret what's been put on the table, essentially. It's to look -- it's to help you to understand what EPA or what the installation is presenting to you in terms of what they discovered in terms of possible remedy and so forth and so on. That again is the sole

purpose for the grant.

And it's to get someone to do this for you, usually someone who's connected perhaps with a university or somebody else who has the expertise to -- we have a lot of recommendations where you can find people to help you do this and you can also bring in your suggestions.

We have in a couple of the installations have folks that were affiliated with the RAB that happen to have that expertise that live in the town and are also potential stakeholders. It all can fit in sometimes. Other times folks will pick somebody from a city 5 or 600 miles away, or a university that's quite a distance from the site, that's a general idea.

I brought some materials on it. I don't have I think enough for everyone. But there's, you know, the basic rundown again of the program. And then I have a couple of application process handbooks that, you know, you can look at afterwards.

And again, I can provide the contact at Region 3 who would be glad to speak with any of you and talk to you about the application process. Does

anybody have any questions?

Actually I did this presentation for this group about a year and a half ago and we went through it, you know, in great detail. And I'm hoping that maybe perhaps since that time there was some thought about it for or against. If anybody has any questions.

CDR. WOOD: Sir, am I correct in the assumption that these are actually matching funds, the amount of money that comes from your agency?

MR. HUDSON: I really didn't get to that part, but yes, it's a good -- it's not exactly matching, it's sort of you have to make up for some of the money. And there's different ways you can do it. Most of it can be done in-kind, that is to say if you perform the office work and so forth that's necessary for some portions of it, or you do the paperwork --

MR. ROTH: Can you sort out for him and for me, when you say "you," it's a pronoun, who are you referring to?

MR. HUDSON: You would be the TAG group.

MR. ROTH: The TAG group, not the U.S.

Navy?

MR. HUDSON: Yes. The Navy would actually have little to do with this TAG grant.

CDR. WOOD: So the corporation that would need to be formed --

MR. ROTH: Where is the corporation going to get this money?

MR. HUDSON: That's what the grant is for.

MR. ROTH: Is this a Catch-22, say we get the grant but we have to match it and we're going to use the grant to match it?

MR. EDMOND: The matching is more or less in sweat equity, we'll put it. The work that you put into the process along with the money, say you Xerox all the literature for passing out to the RAB members or the office work in sorting out the data or finding the technical representative you use, that's what they're talking about.

MR. DUNLEAVY: Even mileage driving to to and from the meetings and stuff like that I believe comes into play. The group has to demonstrate that they've been expending effort time and money --

MR. EDMOND: Sweat equity.

MR. DUNLEAVY: -- in seeing what's going on at these meetings and that they need further assistance, they have to demonstrate that they've spent, you know, a certain amount of dollars. I don't know what the amount is, but once they demonstrate that, they can get the grant.

MR. HUDSON: I'm not exactly sure of exactly the amount that you have to make up, and it's not -- it's a portion, I think about a quarter, but I'm not exactly sure on that.

But the point of it is that you could, for instance, use part of that money to have the office type work done for you. Another thing you could do with TAG grant money is to get fact sheets together and issue them to the public, that money can be used for that. You could also put a value on the time that you spend doing these things, and that would be a part of your in-kind matching money.

You could, for instance, you could hire someone to try to find the technical advisor for you, but if you do it yourself, you can put a value on that and use that as part of the matching grant. This is something would be a very good idea to

discuss with Amelia Levertz, because she knows exactly per se what you have to say. But that's the idea, and I'm glad you brought that up.

MR. COLTER: Bill, I'll just point out that I attended a training course on TAPP, and one of the modules was the comparison to TAG, so I do have a presentation. If it were come to the group wanting to pursue a TAG versus a TAPP, you know, we could go ahead and put this presentation up and come down to some of the rules. But I think when you see the differences and some of the benefits between TAPP and TAG, you may not want to pursue TAG as much as DoD's TAPP grant, if you want to pursue it at all.

MR. HUDSON: The TAPP program is basically a program where you ask for a technical assistant and the DoD entity takes care of it for you. I mean that's the short story. This you wouldn't have much in the way of administering situation. And the difference there is with the TAG grant, you have moneys that are provided to the group. Of course you have to go through the processes that I mentioned, and then you administer the grant and get reimbursement from the government.

So yeah, there's some major differences there. And when Jim does his, you'll see, you know, a major difference there.

Another thing, Jim, and I don't know whether you found out or not, I still have not been able to get a clearcut picture on whether there can be a TAG and a TAPP grant.

MR. COLTER: No. I'll go over that.

MR. HUDSON: Thanks.

MR. EDMOND: Thanks, Bill. Jim?

MR. COLTER: At the last meeting, there was an interest in this new DoD initiative called the Technical Assistance for Public Participation. And it just so happened that between the last meeting and this meeting, I attended a pretty intensive training seminar down in Washington about the TAPP. And I know that Mr. McCaffrey, you asked about maybe a pamphlet of some kind, and that's what I have here. And if you need anymore, if you want, let me know, I'll get you as many as you want.

The TAPP program, what we're going to briefly go over, I scaled down the training session that I went to into something a little more manageable. I'll describe what the TAPP is, the

purpose behind the TAPP, who's it for, why would the DoD even want to enter into some kind of program like this. Then we'll go into how the RAB itself would get assistance provided. We'll define what projects are eligible, and we'll go over some rules and responsibilities of the RAB group and the DoD group.

What is TAPP? It was initiated and language entered in the National Defense Authorization Act of '96. That language has not been finalized yet, so everything here is based on -- it was supposed to be final -- the proposed rule was supposed to be final in December of '97. Down in Congress, things, you know, usually don't happen on time. It is expected though to be final.

Basically from the language of the law, Technical Assistance for Public Participation is a program which can provide independent assistance in interpreting scientific and engineering issues with regard to environmental hazards at restoration activities. The goal of the program is to enhance the public's ability to participate in the decision making process by improving their understanding of overall conditions and activities.

Why should we have this? Well, as you can see on the table there, pretty voluminous type of reports that we send out periodically. We have a right to involve -- you have a right to be involved. You, the public. It also demonstrates the commitment of the DoD to the community. It enables you to better participate in the technical aspects of our program. It would provide you a more credible source of expertise, if one doesn't already exist, and I'll explain that a little bit more. The last one, restore trust if our credibility is low. Hopefully, that's not the issue here at Willow Grove, but there are RABs in place where government and federal credibility is low and the RAB has a right to challenge the DoD's decisions.

Who is it for? Basically, community members of the RABs.

Now, you need to justify why you need a TAPP. The RAB community, and the key word -- I probably went too fast -- is to demonstrate a need for this type of assistance. And a demonstrated need, you have to answer one these two criteria in the law. The first criteria is the RAB must demonstrate that, in this case the Navy, or the EPA

or State responsible for overseeing us doesn't have the technical expertise to explain the issues to you. Nine times out of ten, you won't be able to meet that criteria. So there's a second criteria.

The technical assistance is likely to contribute to better efficiency, more effectiveness, more timeliness of a review. And at the same time, it was likely to contribute to your acceptance of our information. So that's where the justification would lie that it's easier for you to understand, you're hiring somebody to put it in laymen's terms, that type of thing.

The first -- it's kind of confusing, but the first criteria is you have to meet one of the previous two criteria items. The second criteria is there must be a majority of the RAB must agree, there must be a majority vote that this type of assistance is needed.

When I say that there's no technical expertise out there, what we're going to offer you is other avenues to get your issue resolved. One of the first avenues would be our installation restoration contractor, Brown and Root or EA Engineering, the people that are working for us. I

believe to date Russ and his group have done a pretty excellent job in explaining the issues and in laymen's terms. So to say that the expertise doesn't exist, you know, is not quite accurate. There's also local, state, and federal staff.

Bill just gave you a presentation on TAG. If you wanted to learn the ins and outs of TAG, you wouldn't be able to hire a technical assistance provider, Bill has done that for you.

In previous RABs, we gave you a toxicological training session by Navy Environmental Health Center. The next RAB actually we'll be doing another one on risk assessment, human health risk assessment, definitions, terminology. That's another eligible project that you could hire a technical assistance provider for. We do it for free.

The other avenues of support, universities, as Bill had mentioned, sometimes universities like to come in and do a thesis on one of our sites and that's usually low cost.

The other avenues of support is what Bill went, over the TAG grants and TOSC grants. TOSC is basically the same thing but only available

for non-NPL sites. So if you have a TAG grant -- this goes back to Bill's point -- if you have a TAG grant, you already have an avenue for technical assistance; therefore, you cannot get a TAPP grant at that point.

The reverse though I believe is not true, if you have a TAPP grant, you can get a TAG if you're willing to incorporate, provide in-kind matching services, and do the contract administration portions of it, you can probably get a TAG if you have a TAPP. But you can't get a TAPP if you already have a TAG. If that's clear, I don't know.

Why should the DoD initiate a program like this? Well, it promotes us as a good neighbor. It increases the DoD's confidence in our program, as we are allowing it to be subjected to a third party review. It hopefully increases your confidence in what we're doing as you see our willingness to share information openly. If you meet those two items, you obviously should get a more responsive cleanup, less issues at the end of the road.

Now, how is the assistance provided? As Bill had mentioned, TAG grants, you have to

incorporate and therefore the corporation has to do the contract administration, the scope of work, you have to procure the contractor, do the invoices, things that many of you may not have the expertise in doing.

TAPP, the DoD will do all that contract administration for you. We'll help you procure a technical assistant. We won't pick one, but we'll help you get him under contract. We'll utilize your input in the selection criteria process of what goes in the scope of work. We'll use existing environmental restoration funds. But because we do that, we have to put a limit value on the dollar amount.

Because we want to use what's called simpler acquisition procedures, we have a 25 thousand dollar maximum, or one percent of what we call a cost to complete, which is a program we use to put in general questions and answers. And through a cost program, you get a bottom line. And we have done that for Willow Grove, but it has a lot of subjectivity to it, since we don't have, at the time we did the cost analysis, we didn't know how much soil we had to remove, how many ground water

wells we might have to put in, things like that. It's more the 25 thousand dollar cap that will govern it.

You also see a hundred thousand dollar lifetime limit. For the life of this RAB, you'll be able to get only a hundred thousand dollars of TAPP funding. If that's four big 25 thousand dollar projects, so be it. It may be 10 10 thousand dollars projects. This is in there so it doesn't appear that we have an open checkbook. It puts a lot of onus on the RAB of what projects do you really need third party assistance that we can't provide you as the Navy.

The benefits of us managing the TAPP contract obviously eliminates the burden of contract administration on the RAB members. Your only responsibility really is to fill out the application form. You will not have to incorporate as a citizens group, therefore, you will not have to come up with any in-kind matching funding.

What are eligible projects? Interpretation of technical documents, review of -- and there's one on the table there -- review of proposed restoration technologies. There will be a

similar report called a feasibility study coming out after we get through this process of documenting what our proposed technologies are.

Participate in relative risk site evaluations, which is the Navy's way of prioritizing our sites. Understanding health and environmental implications of cleanup strategies, and training, the NEHC training on toxicology, risk assessment, those type of things. You know, technical documents, risk assessments, human health risk assessments, the proposed restoration technologies, considering different alternatives, again helping, you know, understanding what relative risk is and how we use it to prioritize our sites. The implications of cleanup strategies, training.

Ineligible projects, things that you will not get a TAPP grant for, political activities and lobbying, legal type actions against the Navy, if it was warranted, generation of new data. The point here is you cannot hire a consultant to go out and take samples for you and do an independent study on the property. That will not be funded.

Reopening DoD, the final DoD decisions, such as ROD, things like that, you will not be able

to do that. And basically the last one, community outreach. If you wanted to put together a fact sheet of your own about how the RAB is working at Willow Grove, you're more than welcome to do that, however, you will not get DoD funding for that. We provide that in our fact sheets, this pamphlet that I handed out, things like that.

After we get results, it's incumbent upon us to publicize the results. We'll put the results of the report in the information repository. We'll announce it at the public meeting, probably have a presentation on it. And obviously if the results come back, useful results come back, we'll incorporate those into our IR program, things that we overlooked.

There is an appeals process. This has been established so that the RAB members can appeal decisions regarding approval or disapproval of a project. I'll go into this a little bit more down the road, where the installation commanding officer has the final say on whether a TAPP grant gets approved or not. If you don't agree with that, if he denies a project, there is a process in here for your appeal.

If the appeals process cannot be resolved at the CO level at the installation, it will go up to his major claimant. If he can't resolve it, it will actually go up to Assistant Secretary Navy level. This is for information. I don't foresee that ever getting to that point.

Some ground rules for the appeal. Again, there must be a majority of the RAB that wants to pursue the appeal. You must then appoint a single spokesperson, have some written justification. The appeals have to follow the chain of command that I previously showed. And obviously the goal is to try to resolve these issues at the lowest level possible. In this room is the lowest level possible. And we will try to resolve any and all issues here before they have to go up to the CO.

This is kind of a flow chart of pretty much what I've just gone over. The RAB will determine that there's a need. At that point, the DoD co-chair, which is pretty much we will assist the DoD co-chair as DoD representatives, we'll assist you in preparing the application. You will then forward the application to us for review -- to the DoD co-chair.

And I'll go through a lot of this in a little more detail, but we're going to try to tell you what's eligible and ineligible. So whatever we send up to the installation commanding officer will be an eligible project. If we already know the rules in here, there's not much sense in sending something up that we already know is going to be denied.

If the installation commander sees that the project is eligible, then our contracts office down in Northern Division will start putting the contract administration wheels moving and getting a preferred provider under contract, one of which you have selected already.

We'll do contract administration. We'll get the assistance. He'll do whatever the project is you've hired him to do and provide a closeout report.

Some other key individuals, the DoD representatives, myself, the Commander, Jim, Debbie, community reps, all of you, and the installation commanding officer. Our roles pretty much are to inform and train you. That's what I'm here tonight to do. We should ensure that funds are available,

and to most of the extent, funds will be made available if a project is warranted.

Contract management of the contractor, we're here to work with you in the application form. We also help the commanding officer. We'll report the results.

We will act as a moderator for the RAB, if that's needed. And you can imagine with 20 some different members, there could be different agendas that certain individuals want to pursue. Again, we're going to try to moderate that for you so you can focus your needs on what projects you need. You only got 25 thousand a year, a hundred thousand dollars for the life of the RAB. So you have to be focused on what project do you really need us to fund, again, other than what we can give you for free.

Working with the RAB, we'll help you determine if you've met the criteria in the National Defense Authorization Act. We'll also certify that there is a majority of the community members that want this. We'll help you define and scope out an eligible project. We'll help you certify a search for alternate support, that alternate support does

not exist either from our contractor, a university, things on that slide I showed you.

We'll propose, we won't select, a technical assistance provider. We may have a list of a database of who we feel is a competent contractor. By no means do you have to follow that, but we do have a pretty extensive list of contractors out there in the environmental field. And we'll help you complete the TAPP request form.

Working with the CO of the base, we're going to work with him to recommend project approval or disapproval. Again, if it's not going to be approved, we won't even send it up. So those will only be approval projects.

We'll recommend waivers. There is a waiver to the 25 thousand dollar limit, but there's a process you have to go through to try to prove that you need more than 25 thousand dollars to review a project. We'll also, again, put the results in the information repository and other publications. We'll devote a RAB to announcing what the findings of that contractor came up with, and we'll incorporate those results into our program, if they got some good ideas. We're not -- we are

willing to incorporate new ideas. We don't pretend to know all the answers.

I mentioned this a little bit before, we're going to help you reach concensus, if required, to pursue your top priorities, what should the project provide, these are things that go into the scope of work to potential providers. We'll help you review qualifications that they submit and maybe help steer you in a direction of what we think is a good provider. And we have a role in the appeals process basically to keep you informed of discussions between the CO and the DoD members of the RAB. We will be your advocate with the CO, why this needs -- why this appeal should go through. And we will have some alternatives ready so he can make a better decision.

Your role as community members, you need to have an understanding of our installation restoration program. Hopefully, the last several meetings, you've kind of got a flavor for what our program is, some of the terminology. You need to focus on your needs, what's an eligible project, what is ineligible. You need to come to some agreement about what the project is going to be. If

the project dollar amounts are small enough, you can have two or three projects in a year, if so warranted. And you must meet the requirements of the law. And basically, you know, you have to answer and prove can the information be provided without TAPP funding, or will this project help you better understand what you're reviewing and help your acceptance of what you're reviewing. Then we'll fill out the TAPP request form.

And that's about all I'm going to say about that right now. If we get into a situation where a TAPP project is felt to be required and we pursue that, I'll come back up and we'll go through the TAPP request form and help you get it filled out.

Nominating a provider, there are minimum qualifications in the law that have to be met in order for somebody to be considered a provider. You, as basically the customer, can obviously write in any other qualifications that you want to try to narrow down people that submit quotes for the work. As a minimum, they must have a demonstrated knowledge of hazardous or toxic waste issues and laws. They must have academic training

in the relevant disciplines. And they must be able to translate technical information into laymen's terms. Other examples of what you might want them to have is some experience in working on a hazardous waste site, knowledge in the local geology here, some experience in technical presentations, a couple others that, just to throw out that you might want to write in your scope of work.

After the project's completed, there's some -- there's some requirements, just reporting requirements. The contractor has to give you a report, and that report must be made available to the general public.

And the last role is of the installation commander. I've pretty much gone over his roles throughout the presentation. He is tasked to implement the law. We should have already done that if we've done our job, and we will not be forwarding an ineligible project, hopefully. He will approve the projects ultimately so funding can be released from the DoD. He'll ultimately recommend waivers to the funding. And again, he has a very substantial role in the appeals process.

For approving the projects, there's

some questions, is adequate funding available, does -- he's going to ask us does the project meet the eligibility criteria, and is there a majority request, is the majority of the RAB interested in having a certain project.

If he disapproves a project for any reason, he'll have to -- it's probably because of funding, failure to meet eligibility, or that he has determined that there are alternate sources out there. And he will have to give you his rationale and some alternatives back to you of why he disapproved the project.

Again, there's waivers to the funding. With the CO's blessing, he'll send it up the chain to the DoD to release the funding. They will ultimately though have the final say whether they grant the waiver or not. And that's his role in the appeals process. The lowest possible avenue to get it resolved, again this room is actually below him. We should get all our issues resolved at this level.

That's TAPP in a nutshell. Again, it was a three-day training course down in D.C. There's a lot more on the TAPP request form, things like that that may or may not come up. But again,

TAPP isn't available as of yet. The rule hasn't been finalized, but it's imminent, as I'm told, that it will be available. And if the RAB here thinks that there's a project that they would like to have funded, we can certainly start dialogue and discussion of why you need it, what's it going to accomplish, and some of the other benefits that go along with the rules. Any questions or anything?

MR. EDMOND: Thanks, Jim.

MR. HUDSON: Just a couple of points that you brought to mind that I thought we should mention. If I understand correctly, the TAPP program is only for RAB members; is that correct?

MR. COLTER: In this case, yeah. It's also for TRC groups, but it's for RABs and TRCs, yes.

MR. HUDSON: And I just wanted to point out that the difference with the TAG program is that the program is available to a group organizing itself to apply for the TAG, not necessarily RAB members, but it could of course include RAB members. And another point is that when this group does make application for the TAG grant, we place an advertisement in the paper and so forth to try to

let the public know that this grant is being applied for. And it asks people to either join up with you, or if they want to counter you, to try to form their own group and make their own application so that they can be considered at the same time as you. So, you know, I think that's an interesting distinction there as well.

MR. COLTER: One point I didn't bring up, there is a clause, a conflict of interest clause in the law. It's similar language to what's in the RAB dialogue, that RAB members have to come because they represent the community, not to come in search of work.

Same rules apply to TAPP grants, if there's -- if you have someone you know that can provide a certain service, you can go ahead and say hey, I know this guy. Because of the funding limit, it's very easy for us to basically sole source out to that person. If the person happens to be on the RAB -- and I'll use Eric Lindhult as an example, he works for Dames and Moore, Dames and Moore will not be getting a TAPP grant because he is on the RAB and there is a conflict of interest type of clause there for that. But if somebody knows a neighbor that's

an environmental consultant -- and we're dealing with small business, we're not going to be going to like Dames and Moore or some of the other bigger environmental firms, we're going to be dealing with small business contractors. If somebody knows a small business contractor that's in the environmental field, if he meets those minimum qualifications and you are comfortable with that person as being able to provide you the support, it's a simple process to get them under contract.

Other than that, you can put notices in the paper, any other way to get the word out. And all that we need is three independent quotes. We'll do a little estimate of what we think the project will cost, and we'll review those quotes. It's not a low bid type of thing. You certainly can choose the low bid if you want, or you can go with the most expensive bid if you think he'll give you a better dollar value. There's a little bit different contract administration because of the limits on the dollar amount.

MR. EDMOND: Any questions?

MR. ROTH: I'm inclined, just speaking as one person here, to think that -- I don't feel a

need for this. That said, I sense a push by the DoD employees towards the TAPP, which is less independent than the TAG. The other thing is that depending on what the people in the RAB feel, even if it's not felt that we really need it, time lines and bureaucratic delay being what it is, it might be worth considering applying. That doesn't mean you have to spend it, but it does get the time line running. Comment?

MR. COLTER: Well, as far as our preference, the DoD really doesn't have a preference. The preference would be incumbent upon what the RAB wants to undertake. If you do undertake the TAG program, those of you who are in the corporation will have to do all the contract administration. We're here to provide that for you. That's just a benefit of us doing it. The in-kind matching services, the ability to incorporate as a nonprofit organization, all of that is somewhat cumbersome. None of that is needed with the TAPP.

We're here to run the contract, get them under contract, spell out the scope of work that you define and use our contacts to get a consultant under contract immediately.

Yeah, there are a lot of bureaucratic delays with this, but you cannot apply for a TAPP grant unless you have a specified project in mind. That's part of the application form. That's why if you think one is needed, and we're at a stage now where we have a draft report coming out in mid March, if the rule was final and funding was available, yeah, we'd have to start maybe right now in scoping out a project, filling out the application form, picking a consultant for you, you know, you guys -- I'm saying us as a RAB -- picking a consultant that you're comfortable with to try and keep us on our schedule as much as possible.

If that's not possible, my opinion, the way that I run the program, I'm more than willing to delay certain milestones if your contractor isn't ready to give out a report. By no means am I going to finalize a report without, you know, if timing isn't there, we'll make the necessary adjustments to get his report incorporated into our document.

MR. EDMOND: Any other comments, questions? Any comments or questions on anything that was talked about this evening? Then I'd like to close up the meeting then with setting a date for

the next meeting. We usually pick a date, give you two dates and it's a three --

MR. ROTH: Wait a minute. Wait a minute. We do have this particular thing on the table and whether we should be proceeding or not.

MR. COLTER: It's everliving. It's always on the table.

MR. ROTH: To close the meeting now, this dies.

MS. GEMMILL: I don't think it dies.

MR. ROTH: But it puts it off for whatever period of time.

MS. GEMMILL: Well, it tables it for the next meeting.

MR. COLTER: Your community co-chair, if there's a need between this meeting and next meeting and somebody wants to -- again, it's the RAB community members that must come to a majority. I would suggest calling Liz, maybe having a small get-together of the RAB members outside of the RAB meeting and discuss whether you want to pursue this or not. By no means does it die after this meeting.

MR. ROTH: I mean I spoke as one member and I said I don't really see the need for it.

MR. VETRINI: Well, I have to agree with you. As a taxpayer, to me, you guys have been doing a fantastic -- I don't understand 99 percent of what you said, but you're doing a very good job.

MR. COLTER: We need to do a little bit better job then. We need to make sure you understand it.

MR. LEOPOLD: I have to agree with the two gentlemen. From what I've received, and again I'm in the same boat as you are, I don't know 99 percent, the information we have been receiving, it is an ongoing investigation going on with these various sites, etc., etc., I mean what are we looking for to be spending extra money, what are we proving?

MR. COLTER: And that's a key point that the funding, not the way the Navy is structured, but for other services, Army and Air Force, where their funding is driven by the installation, the key here is that the money comes out of the same pot that's appropriated. There's no separate pot of money. So if you spend 25 thousand on a TAPP project, that's 25 thousand dollars of cleanup or investigation that doesn't get done.

The Navy is set up a little bit differently. It's a little bit easier for us to go off and pick up an extra 25 thousand because we have regional offices like where I work down in Philadelphia that manages the money. And if another project manager in my office can't spend money in his base, we can get a hold of it and filter it up to Willow Grove. So it's a little bit different aspect, but it's a good point that overall there's no new money. And the environmental restoration fund is going down yearly by several hundred million dollars.

MR. LEOPOLD: I have to be honest, we were sitting over there in NAWC, or formerly what was NAWC, that might be a whole different ballgame because heaven only knows what's sitting over there in that dirt over the last 15 years.

MR. ROTH: Let me say that it's the same outfit that ran it.

MR. LEOPOLD: No, sir, I have to disagree. I've been around this base for 30 years. There's pretty much fuel, wash fluids, hydraulic fluids, oils. There's no sophisticated -- in the 30 years that I've been involved in this base that I

knew of, and I was stationed here -- any sophisticated chemicals, in quotes, as there possibly could have been in NAWC, and I'm not saying that there was. But over there was a lot of experimentation going on.

MR. ROTH: You drink bottled water over there?

MR. LEOPOLD: No, I live in Warminster Township and I drink the township water and I'm healthy, at least so far.

CDR. WOOD: Let me just say that regardless of what the contaminants are either here or over there, that we're going to continue from the Navy's perspective to try to make it clear what we're doing and what the best course of action is going to be. We consider ourselves members of the community and want to clean it up as much as you all do.

And I would say at the minimum, let's go through the process and try and get the executive summaries out so that they're clear. If they're not clear, we'll try and make them clear so that everybody understands what the issue is. And if at some point we're not satisfied with that or the

board's not satisfied that we've made it clear, then we can pursue the TAPP or the other program. Does that seem reasonable?

MR. ROTH: I think it would be a little bit more comforting if the commander were here himself, which I assume you're not.

CDR. WOOD: I'm the Executive Officer, co-chair of the committee. And the CO of the base has the same feelings that I've just expressed to you as far as wanting to ensure we have the proper cleanup of the base, and as Colonel Moss is here for his side of the base, you know, he's fully on board with this. Just at this point in time, it's not appropriate for him to be sitting in on these meetings.

MR. EDMOND: May I add, as the ExO said, as the executive officer, DoD mandates that the executive officer sits as the -- is the selected person to sit as the co-chair for the military with the community co-chair, not the commanding officer.

CDR. WOOD: One of the reasons for that is he's in the appeal chain. So if he's in the process of making the decision, then he doesn't have that separation to be able to stand back and do an

appropriate appeal.

MR. EDMOND: And when the meeting is adjourned, it's just this meeting is adjourned. The process does not adjourn, it continues. I'm always available, Jim is always available, the Public Affairs officer is always available, both the Navy and the Air Force. Any information you need, it's at the information repository. And Jim and I are both, you know, more than happy to answer any questions you may have or direct you to somebody at EPA or PaDEP.

MR. ROTH: The reason I stopped you because I hadn't heard from any of the people at the RAB, and I expressed a personal opinion.

MS. GEMMILL: Well, you want the community co-chair to state her opinion? I think they're doing a wonderful job, I really do. I'm very impressed at every meeting that I've attended, and I think I've been to every one, right, Jim?

MR. EDMOND: Yes, ma'am.

MS. GEMMILL: I think fortunately we are not out as the community, civilian community, we're not out to get the military. I don't think the military is hiding things. I think they're

being very upfront and open with us. I appreciate that as a taxpayer. And I think that we can continue working together.

I think if there's problems, we work together and clean it up. I think the grant money is there. If we find that we need to apply for it at some point in time because there's a project that we want to undertake, then that's what it's there for.

MR. COLTER: That's a key point that the credibility --

MS. GEMMILL: That's personal.

MR. COLTER: The credibility question is what's key. And we do have RABs at military installations where there's a lot of distrust, things like that. And I think the DoD recognized that there was a level of distrust, but the way the process was, it was that's too bad, we're going to continue on with our schedule. And I think that's not really a good business decision when you're dealing with diverse community groups. So it's their way of saying, well, here's something we'll throw out on the table to try to build our credibility back up with you.

As I said earlier, I hope that isn't the situation at this base; and if it is, we need to address it immediately, but I don't get that feel.

What we're going to do as an example is when you get this report in mid March, and maybe even before then, you'll see a lot of discussion on human health risk assessment, ecological risk assessment, you'll see the term used, you'll see formulas. And if you don't understand it, and quite frankly, I don't understand it entirely, we have experts. And Barbara Douglas is one of those that interprets and makes sure the contractor has used the formulas in the right context. It's a cumbersome process, although we use it at times to base cleanup goals. So you have to understand the basics of risk assessment.

That being said, if we were not going to do what we're going to do at the next meeting, I would suggest that would be a perfect TAPP grant project, get somebody in here to teach us what is risk assessment, how is it used.

One of the ultimate sources though, we're going to provide it to you. Next meeting Navy Environmental Health Center will be up, and he'll

give a presentation and a training session on risk assessment. If you need more training than that, at that time we'll have to, you know, address that, depending on how good a job they do.

But that's kind of how the process works. Nine times out of ten, we're going to try to provide you with a credible source of information if we can.

MR. EDMOND: It will be the same gentleman who gave the toxicology will be up here to do risk assessment in March. What we have planned is to make the next meeting for 4th of March, which is a Wednesday evening. That will be before you get these reports, to give you some background so you kind of have some understanding on what you're reading when we talk about risk assessment.

And if no one has any problems with that, we'll make the next meeting for 4 March, right here, same time, 6:00 in the evening.

Anymore questions or comments? We have the next meeting set. As I said, it will be a NEHC presentation. There will be some other information given out at the meeting also, but the majority of the focus will be on risk assessment to give the RAB

background on what they're going to dive into in the next reports.

MS. REIGH: I have a comment to make, being a newer member to this group, and I am the State regulator, would it benefit you to give a brief presentation on our setup and how we deal with what comes in from this base and how --

MR. EDMOND: We would be more than happy to have you give a presentation.

MS. REIGH: -- how we look at it.

MR. EDMOND: That would be great. Would you like to give a presentation?

MS. REIGH: Yes.

MR. EDMOND: How about if I give you my card after the end of the meeting, give me a call and we'll talk and set it up and what you're going to talk about, what your needs would be, and put you on the agenda.

MS. REIGH: Because we can Power Point up on the screen.

MS. HUGHES: That would give you a good idea of where they're getting their goals that they're setting and why they've chosen to go this way or that.

MR. EDMOND: We have never meant to leave the State out. The State's never been forthcoming at the RAB meetings. They've always sat in the background.

MS. HUGHES: We don't feel snubbed, we're fine.

MR. EDMOND: Okay. Then if there's no other comments or questions, we'll adjourn this meeting to the 4th of March. Hope you have a nice winter.

(Proceedings closed.)

CERTIFICATION

I, Loretta B. Devery, do hereby certify that the testimony and proceedings in the foregoing matter, taken on January 14, 1998, are contained fully and accurately in the stenographic notes taken by me and that it is a true and correct transcript of the same.

Loretta B. Devery

LORETTA B. DEVERY, RPR

NOTARIAL SEAL
LORETTA B. DEVERY, Notary Public
Lower Southampton Twp Bucks County
My Commission Expires August 13, 2001

The foregoing certification of this transcript does not apply to any reproduction of the same by any means unless under the direct control and/or supervision of the certifying reporter.
